arXiv:1611.06815v1 [math.CO] 21 Nov 2016

Uniquely restricted matchings and edge colorings

Julien Baste[1], Dieter Rautenbach[2], and Ignasi Sau[1,3]

[1] CNRS, LIRMM, Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France
baste@lirmm.fr, sau@lirmm.fr
[2] Institute of Optimization and Operations Research, Ulm University, Ulm, Germany
dieter.rautenbach@uni-ulm.de
[3] Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal do Ceará, Fortaleza, Brazil

Abstract. A matching in a graph is *uniquely restricted* if no other matching covers exactly the same set of vertices. This notion was defined by Golumbic, Hirst, and Lewenstein and studied in a number of articles. Our contribution is twofold. We provide approximation algorithms for computing a uniquely restricted matching of maximum size in some bipartite graphs. In particular, we achieve a ratio of 9/5 for subcubic bipartite graphs, improving over a 2-approximation algorithm proposed by Mishra. Furthermore, we study the *uniquely restricted chromatic index* of a graph, defined as the minimum number of uniquely restricted matchings into which its edge set can be partitioned. We provide tight upper bounds in terms of the maximum degree and characterize all extremal graphs. Our constructive proofs yield efficient algorithms to determine the corresponding edge colorings.

Keywords: uniquely restricted matching; bipartite graph; approximation algorithm; edge coloring; subcubic graph.

1 Introduction

Matchings in graphs are among the most fundamental and well-studied objects in combinatorial optimization [25, 32]. While classical matchings lead to many efficiently solvable problems, more restricted types of matchings [30] are often intractable; induced matchings [3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 18–20, 26] being a prominent example. Here we study the so-called uniquely restricted matchings, which were introduced by Golumbic, Hirst, and Lewenstein [14] and studied in a number of papers [13, 21–23, 27, 29]. We also consider the corresponding edge coloring notion.

Before we explain our contribution and discuss related research, we collect some terminology and notation (cf. e.g. [8] for undefined terms). We consider finite, simple, and undirected graphs. A *matching* in a graph G [25] is a set of pairwise non-adjacent edges of G. For a matching M, let $V(M)$ be the set of vertices incident with an edge in M. A matching M in a graph G is *induced* [10] if the subgraph $G[V(M)]$ of G induced by $V(M)$ is 1-regular. Golumbic, Hirst, and Lewenstein [14] define a matching M in a graph G to be *uniquely restricted* if there is no matching M' in G with $M' \neq M$ and $V(M') = V(M)$, that is, no other matching covers exactly the same set of vertices. It is easy to see that a matching M in G is uniquely restricted if and only if there is no M*-alternating*

cycle in G, which is a cycle in G that alternates between edges in M and edges not in M. Let the *matching number* $\nu(G)$, the *strong matching number* $\nu_s(G)$, and the *uniquely restricted matching number* $\nu_{ur}(G)$ of G be the maximum size of a matching, an induced matching, and a uniquely restricted matching in G, respectively. Since every induced matching is uniquely restricted, we obtain

$$\nu_s(G) \leq \nu_{ur}(G) \leq \nu(G)$$

for every graph G.

Each type of matching naturally leads to an edge coloring notion. For a graph G, let $\chi'(G)$ be the *chromatic index* of G, which is the minimum number of matchings into which the edge set $E(G)$ of G can be partitioned. Similarly, let the *strong chromatic index* $\chi'_s(G)$ [11] and the *uniquely restricted chromatic index* $\chi'_{ur}(G)$ of G be the minimum number of induced matchings and uniquely restricted matchings into which the edge set of G can be partitioned, respectively. A partition of the edges of a graph G into uniquely restricted matchings is a *uniquely restricted edge coloring* of G. Another related notion are *acyclic edge colorings*, which are partitions of the edge set into matchings such that the union of every two of the matchings is a forest. The minimum number of matchings in an acyclic edge coloring of a graph G is its *acyclic chromatic index* $a'(G)$ [1, 12]. Exploiting the obvious relations between the different edge coloring notions, we obtain

$$\chi'(G) \leq a'(G) \leq \chi'_{ur}(G) \leq \chi'_s(G) \tag{1}$$

for every graph G.

Stockmeyer and Vazirani [30] showed that computing the strong matching number is NP-hard. Their result was strengthened in many ways, and also restricted graph classes where the strong matching number can be determined efficiently were studied [3, 6, 7, 26]. Golumbic, Hirst, and Lewenstein [14] showed that it is NP-hard to determine $\nu_{ur}(G)$ for a given bipartite or split graph G. Mishra [27] strengthened this by showing that it is not possible to approximate $\nu_{ur}(G)$ within a factor of $O(n^{\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, unless NP=ZPP, even when restricted to bipartite, split, chordal or comparability graphs of order n. Furthermore, he showed that $\nu_{ur}(G)$ is APX-complete for subcubic bipartite graphs.

On the positive side, Golumbic, Hirst, and Lewenstein [14] described efficient algorithms that determine $\nu_{ur}(G)$ for cacti, threshold graphs, and proper interval graphs. Solving a problem from [14], Francis, Jacob, and Jana [13] described an efficient algorithm for $\nu_{ur}(G)$ in interval graphs. Solving yet another problem from [14], Penso, Rautenbach, and Souza [29] showed that the graphs G with $\nu(G) = \nu_{ur}(G)$ can be recognized in polynomial time. Complementing his hardness results, Mishra [27] proposed a 2-approximation algorithm for cubic bipartite graphs.

While $\chi'(G)$ of a graph G of maximum degree Δ is either Δ or $\Delta + 1$ [31], Erdős and Nešetřil [11] conjectured $\chi'_s(G) \leq \frac{5}{4}\Delta^2$, and much of the research on the strong chromatic index is motivated by this conjecture. Building on earlier work of Molloy and Reed [28], Bruhn and Joos [4] showed $\chi'_s(G) \leq 1.93\Delta^2$ provided that Δ is sufficiently large. For further results on the strong chromatic index we refer to [2, 11, 16, 17].

Fiamčik [12] and Alon, Sudakov, and Zaks [1] conjectured that every graph of maximum degree Δ has an acyclic edge coloring using no more than $\Delta+2$ colors.

See [5, 9] for further references and the currently best known results concerning general graphs and graphs of large girth.

In view of the famous open conjectures on $\chi'_s(G)$ and $a'(G)$, the inequality chain (1) motivates to study upper bounds on $\chi_{ur}(G)$ in terms of the maximum degree Δ of a graph G.

Our contribution is twofold. We present approximations algorithms for $\nu_{ur}(G)$ in some bipartite graphs in Sections 2-3, and tight bounds on $\chi'_{ur}(G)$ in Section 4.

Concerning the algorithms, improving on Mishra's 2-approximation algorithm [27], we describe in Section 3 a 9/5-approximation algorithm for computing $\nu_{ur}(G)$ of a given bipartite subcubic graph G. This algorithm requires some complicated preprocessing based on detailed local analysis. In order to illustrate our general approach in a cleaner setting, we first describe in Section 2 algorithms for C_4-free bipartite graphs of arbitrary maximum degree.

Concerning the uniquely restricted chromatic index, we achieve best-possible upper bounds in terms of the maximum degree, and even characterize all extremal graphs. Since our proofs are constructive, it is easy to extract efficient algorithms finding the corresponding edge colorings.

We conclude with some open problems in Section 5.

2 Approximation algorithms for C_4-free bipartite graphs

Before we proceed to present the 9/5-approximation algorithm for subcubic bipartite graphs in Section 3, we first describe in this section an approximation algorithm for the C_4-free case. The proof of the next lemma contains the main algorithmic ingredients. Note that the size of the smaller partite set in a bipartite graph is always an upper bound on the uniquely restricted matching number.

For an integer k, let $[k]$ denote the set of positive integers between 1 and k. For a graph G, let $n(G)$ denote its number of vertices.

Lemma 1. *Let $\Delta \geq 3$ be an integer. If G is a connected C_4-free bipartite graph of maximum degree at most Δ with partite sets A and B such that every vertex in A has degree at least 2, and some vertex in B has degree less than Δ, then G has a uniquely restricted matching M of size at least $\frac{(\Delta-1)^2+(\Delta-2)}{(\Delta-1)^3+(\Delta-2)}|A|$. Furthermore, such a matching can be found in polynomial time.*

Proof: We give an algorithmic proof of the lower bound such that the running time of the corresponding algorithm is polynomial in $n(G)$, which immediately implies the second part of the statement. Therefore, let G be as in the statement. Throughout the execution of our algorithm, as illustrated in Fig. 1, we maintain a pair (U, M) such that

(a) U is a subset of $V(G)$,
(b) M is a uniquely restricted matching with $V(M) \subseteq U$,
(c) no vertex in $B \cap U$ has a neighbor in $A \setminus U$,
(d) no vertex in $B \setminus U$ has all its neighbors in $A \cap U$,
(e) if
s vertices in $A \cap U$ are incident with an edge in M,
d vertices in $A \cap U$ are not incident with an edge in M but have a neighbor in $B \setminus U$, and

f vertices in $A \cap U$ are neither incident with an edge in M nor have a neighbor in $B \setminus U$, then

$$(\Delta-1)^2\Big((\Delta-2)s-(d+f)\Big) \geq (\Delta-2)f. \tag{2}$$



Fig. 1. Example for $\Delta = 3$ of the parameters defined in the proof of Lemma 1. The set U is dashed, and the uniquely restricted matching M corresponds to the thicker edges.

Initially, let U and M be empty sets. Note that properties (a) to (e) hold.

As long as U is a proper subset of $V(G)$, we iteratively replace the pair (U, M) with a pair (U', M') such that U is a proper subset of U', M is a proper subset of M', and properties (a) to (e) hold for (U', M'). Let s', d', and f' denote the updated values considered in (e). Once $U = V(G)$, we have $s = |M|$, $d = 0$, and $f = |A| - |M|$, and (2) implies the stated lower bound on $|M|$.

We proceed to the description of the extension operations. Therefore, suppose that U is a proper subset of $V(G)$. Since G is connected, and some vertex in B has degree less than Δ, some vertex u in $B \setminus U$ has less than Δ neighbors in $A \setminus U$, that is, if $d_{\bar{U}}(u) = |N_G(u) \setminus U|$, then $1 \leq d_{\bar{U}}(u) \leq \Delta - 1$, where the first inequality follows from property (d). We choose $u \in B \setminus U$ such that $d_{\bar{U}}(u)$ is as small as possible.

Case 1: $d_{\bar{U}}(u) = 1$.

Let v be the unique neighbor of u in $A \setminus U$. Let $\{u_1, \ldots, u_k\}$ be the set of all vertices u in $B \setminus U$ with $N_G(u) \setminus U = \{v\}$, and note that $1 \leq k \leq \Delta$. Let $U' = U \cup \{u_1, \ldots, u_k, v\}$. For some integer $\ell \leq k$, we may assume that $\{u_1, \ldots, u_\ell\}$ is the set of those u_i with $i \in [k]$ such that u_i has a neighbor in $A \cap U$, and no neighbor of u_i in $A \cap U$ is incident with M. Note that every vertex u_i with $i \in [k] \setminus [\ell]$ either has no neighbor in $A \cap U$ or has some neighbor in $A \cap U$ that is incident with M.

First, suppose that $\ell \geq 2$. Let M' arise from M by adding, for every $i \in [\ell]$, an edge between u_i and a neighbor w_i of u_i in $A \cap U$. Note that all these neighbors w_i in $A \cap U$ are distinct. Indeed, if two vertices u_i and u_j have a common neighbor w in $A \cap U$, then the set of vertices $\{v, u_i, u_j, w\}$ would induce a C_4 in G. Note also that M' is indeed a uniquely restricted matching, as if there exists an edge $u_i w_j$

with $i, j \in [\ell]$ and $i \neq j$ that could potentially create an M'-alternating cycle, then the set of vertices $\{v, u_i, u_j, w_j\}$ would again induce a C_4 in G. Clearly, replacing (U, M) with (U', M'), we maintain properties (a) to (d), and $s' = s+\ell$. Let n_d be the number of vertices in $A \cap U$ that are not incident with an edge in M', have a neighbor in $B \setminus U$, but do not have a neighbor in $B \setminus U'$; note that each such vertex has a neighbor in the set $\{u_1, \ldots, u_k\}$. As every vertex in $\{u_1, \ldots, u_k\}$ is neighbor of v and of a vertex incident with an edge in M', it holds that $n_d \leq k(\Delta - 2) \leq \Delta(\Delta - 2)$. If v has a neighbor in $B \setminus U'$, then $d' = d - n_d + 1$ and $f' = f + n_d$, and, if v has no neighbor in $B \setminus U'$, then $d' = d - n_d$ and $f' = f + n_d + 1$. In both cases $d' + f' = d + f + 1$ and $f' \leq f + n_d + 1$. Since $\frac{(\Delta-1)^2}{\Delta-2}\Big((\Delta - 2)\ell - 1\Big) \geq \Delta(\Delta - 2) + 1 \geq n_d + 1$, property (e) is maintained.

Next, suppose that $\ell \leq 1$. Let M' arise from M by adding the edge $u_1 v$. Clearly, replacing (U, M) with (U', M'), we maintain properties (a) to (d), and $s' = s + 1$. Defining n_d exactly as above, we obtain $n_d \leq k(\Delta - 2) + \ell \leq \Delta(\Delta-2)+1$, $d' = d - n_d$, and $f' = f + n_d$. Since $\frac{(\Delta-1)^2}{\Delta-2}(\Delta-2) \geq \Delta(\Delta-2)+1 \geq n_d$, property (e) is maintained.

Case 2: $2 \leq d_{\bar{U}}(u) \leq \Delta - 1$.

Let $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} = N_G(u) \setminus U$ and let $U' = U \cup \{u, v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$. Note that $2 \leq k \leq \Delta - 1$.

First, suppose that u has a neighbor v in $A \cap U$, and that no neighbor of u in $A \cap U$ is incident with M. Let M' arise from M by adding the edge uv. Clearly, replacing (U, M) with (U', M'), we maintain properties (a) to (c), and $s' = s + 1$. Let us prove that property (d) is also maintained. Since G has no C_4 and $k \geq 2$, no vertex in $B \setminus U$ that is distinct from u can have more than one neighbor among $v_1, \ldots, v_k$. Since we are in Case 2, every vertex in $B \setminus U$ has more than one neighbor in $A \setminus U$, hence property (d) remains true. Similarly as above, let n_d be the number of vertices in $A \cap U$ that are not incident with an edge in M', have a neighbor in $B \setminus U$, but do not have a neighbor in $B \setminus U'$. Note that $n_d \leq \Delta - k - 1$, $d' = d + k - n_d - 1$, and $f' = f + n_d$. Since $\frac{(\Delta-1)^2}{\Delta-2}\Big((\Delta - 2) - (k - 1)\Big) \geq \Delta - k - 1 \geq n_d$, property (e) is maintained.

Next, suppose that u either has no neighbor in $A \cap U$ or some neighbor of u in $A \cap U$ is incident with M. Let M' arise from M by adding the edge uv_1. Clearly, replacing (U, M) with (U', M'), we again maintain properties (a) to (d), and $s' = s + 1$. Note that, in the case where u has a neighbor in $A \cap U$, v_1 does not have neighbors in M because of property (c), which guarantees that M' is indeed a uniquely restricted matching. Defining n_d exactly as above, we obtain $n_d \leq \Delta - k - 1$. Indeed, if u has no neighbor in $A \cap U$, then $n_d = 0$. On the other hand, if u has a neighbor in $A \cap U$ that is incident with M, then $n_d \leq \Delta - k - 1$. As $k \leq \Delta - 1$, in both cases it holds that $n_d \leq \Delta - k - 1$. Also, we get that $d' = d + k - n_d + 1$ and $f' = f + n_d$, and the same calculation as above implies that property (e) is maintained.

Since the considered cases exhaust all possibilities, and in each case we described an extension that maintains the relevant properties, the proof is complete up to the running time of the algorithm, which we proceed to analyze. One can easily check that each extension operation takes time $O(\Delta n)$, where $n = n(G)$. As in each extension operation, the size of U is incremented by at least one, it follows that the overall running time of the algorithm is $O(\Delta n^2)$. □

With Lemma 1 at hand, we proceed to our first approximation algorithm.

Theorem 1. *Let $\Delta \geq 3$ be an integer. For a given connected C_4-free bipartite graph G of maximum degree at most Δ, one can find in polynomial time a uniquely restricted matching M of G of size at least $\frac{(\Delta-1)^2+(\Delta-2)}{(\Delta-1)^3+(\Delta-2)}\nu_{ur}(G)$.*

Proof: Let $\alpha = \frac{(\Delta-1)^2+(\Delta-2)}{(\Delta-1)^3+(\Delta-2)}$ and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all C_4-free bipartite graphs G of maximum degree at most Δ such that every component of G has a vertex of degree less than Δ. First, we prove that, for every given graph G in $\mathcal{G}$, one can find in polynomial time a uniquely restricted matching M of size at least $\alpha\nu_{ur}(G)$. Therefore, let G be in $\mathcal{G}$.

If G has a vertex u of degree 1, and v is the unique neighbor of u, then let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$. Clearly, $\nu_{ur}(G') \geq \nu_{ur}(G) - 1$, and if M' is a uniquely restricted matching of G', then $M' \cup \{uv\}$ is a uniquely restricted matching of G. Note that G' belongs to $\mathcal{G}$. Let G'' be the graph obtained from G' by removing every isolated vertex. Clearly, $\nu_{ur}(G'') \geq \nu_{ur}(G')$, if M'' is a uniquely restricted matching of G'', then M'' is a uniquely restricted matching of G', and G'' belongs to $\mathcal{G}$.

Iteratively repeating these reductions, we efficiently obtain a set M_1 of edges of G as well as a subgraph G_2 of G such that $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}$, $\nu_{ur}(G_2) \geq \nu_{ur}(G) - |M_1|$, $M_1 \cup M_2$ is a uniquely restricted matching of G for every uniquely restricted matching M_2 of G_2, and either $n(G_2) = 0$ or $\delta(G_2) \geq 2$. Note that if G has minimum degree at least 2, then we may choose M_1 empty and G_2 equal to G. Now, by suitably choosing the bipartition of each component K of G_2, and applying Lemma 1 to K, one can determine in polynomial time a uniquely restricted matching M_2 of G_2 with $|M_2| \geq \alpha\nu_{ur}(G_2)$. Since the set $M_1 \cup M_2$ is a uniquely restricted matching of G of size at least $|M_1| + \alpha\nu_{ur}(G_2) \geq |M_1| + \alpha(\nu_{ur}(G) - |M_1|) \geq \alpha\nu_{ur}(G)$, the proof of our claim about $\mathcal{G}$ is complete.

Now, let G be a given connected C_4-free bipartite graph G of maximum degree at most Δ. If G is not Δ-regular, then $G \in \mathcal{G}$, and the desired statement already follows. Hence, we may assume that G is Δ-regular, which implies that its two partite sets A and B are of the same order. By [29], we can efficiently decide whether $\nu_{ur}(G) = \nu(G)$. Furthermore, if $\nu_{ur}(G) = \nu(G)$, then, again by [29], we can efficiently determine a maximum matching that is uniquely restricted. Hence, we may assume that $\nu_{ur}(G) < \nu(G)$. This implies that $\nu_{ur}(G) < |A|$, and, hence, there is some vertex $u \in V(G)$ with $\nu_{ur}(G - u) = \nu_{ur}(G)$. Since $G - u \in \mathcal{G}$ for every vertex u of G, considering the $n(G)$ induced subgraphs $G - u$ for $u \in V(G)$, one can determine in polynomial time a uniquely restricted matching M of G with $|M| \geq \max\{\alpha\nu_{ur}(G - u) : u \in V(G)\} = \alpha\nu_{ur}(G)$. The desired statement follows. □

3 A 9/5-approximation for subcubic bipartite graphs

We show that – at least for $\Delta = 3$ – C_4-freeness is not an essential assumption. Namely, this section is devoted to proving the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *For a given connected subcubic bipartite graph G, one can find in polynomial time a uniquely restricted matching of G of size at least $\frac{5}{9}\nu_{ur}(G)$.*

We believe that Theorem 2 extends to larger maximum degrees, that is, the conclusion of Theorem 1 should hold without the assumption of C_4-freeness.

In order to ease the presentation, in this section we will use figures to describe some of the "patterns" considered by the algorithms. More formally, given a graph G, a *pattern* P is a subgraph of G in which the set of vertices that have neighbors in $V(G) \setminus V(P)$ is fixed.

In all these figures, the partition of the corresponding bipartite subcubic graph into two sets A and B is represented by using squares and circles, respectively. The half-edges specify which vertices in a pattern have neighbors outside of it.

The following lemma is crucial in order to prove Theorem 2; it plays a role similar to the one played by Lemma 1 for proving Theorem 1.



(i) Pattern $R.1$. (ii) Pattern $R.2$. (iii) Pattern $R.3$.

(iv) Pattern $R.4$. (v) Pattern $R.5$. (vi) Pattern $R.6$.

Fig. 2. The six forbidden patterns.

Lemma 2. *If G is a connected subcubic bipartite graph with partite sets A and B such that*

(1) G does not any of the patterns R.1, R.2, R.3, R.4, R.5, or R.6 depicted in Fig. 2,
(2) G does not contain two vertices with the same neighborhood,
(3) each vertex of G has degree at least 2, and
(4) some vertex in B has degree at most 2,

then a uniquely restricted matching M of G of size at least $\frac{5}{9}\nu_{ur}(G)$ can be found in polynomial time.

Proof: If $n(G) \leq 10$, then we solve the problem optimally by brute force (we will see that the largest pattern without neighbors outside of it considered in the proof has 10 vertices). Therefore, we assume henceforth that G contains at least 11 vertices. In the following, we look for a uniquely restricted matching M of size at least $\frac{5}{9}|A|$. As $|A| \geq \nu_{ur}(G)$, this implies the desired result. We define two types of C_4, namely C_4^1 and C_4^2, as follows. A C_4^1 is a subgraph of G isomorphic to a C_4 such that if $V(C_4^1) \cap A = \{a_1, a_2\}$, then $d_G(a_1) = 3$ and $d_G(a_2) = 2$. A C_4^2 is a subgraph of G isomorphic to a C_4 such that if $V(C_4^2) \cap A = \{a_1, a_2\}$, then $d_G(a_1) = d_G(a_2) = 3$. Note that because of condition (2), there is no subgraph G' of G isomorphic to C_4 such that if $V(G') \cap A = \{a_1, a_2\}$, then $d_G(a_1) = d_G(a_2) = 2$, as it implies that a_1 and a_2 have the same neighborhood.

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 1, throughout the execution of our algorithm we maintain a triple (U, M, γ) that respects the following properties:

(a) $U \subseteq V(G)$,
(b) M is a uniquely restricted matching of G such that $V(M) \subseteq U$,
(c) $\gamma : U \cap A \to \{\top, \vdash, \bot\}$,
(d) for every $v \in A \cap U$, $\gamma(v) = \top$ if and only if $v \in V(M)$ and $\gamma(v) = \vdash$ only if that v has at least one neighbor in $B \setminus U$,
(e) there is no edge between vertices in $U \cap B$ and vertices in $A \setminus U$,
(f) every vertex in $B \setminus U$ has at least one neighbor in $A \setminus U$,
(g) if $s = |\{v \in A : \gamma(v) = \top\}|$, $d = |\{v \in A : \gamma(v) = \vdash\}|$, and $f = |\{v \in A : \gamma(v) = \bot\}|$, then
$$4\,(s - (d + f)) \geq f, \quad \text{and} \tag{3}$$
(h) for each C_4^1 G' in $G \setminus U$, there is no vertex v in $N_G(V(G')) \cap U \cap A$ such that $\gamma(v) = \vdash$.

We initialize the algorithm with $U = \emptyset$, $M = \emptyset$, and $\gamma = \varnothing$. Note that properties (a) to (h) are satisfied.

In the first part of the algorithm, we focus on removing the C_4's from $G \setminus U$. For this we first take care the C_4^1's in $G \setminus U$, and then we deal with the C_4^2's.

As long as $G \setminus U$ is not empty, we consider the first of the following cases such that the corresponding condition is fulfilled, where $d_{\bar{U}}(u) = |N_G(u) \setminus U|$:

- Case 1: there exists $u \in B \setminus U$ such that $d_{\bar{U}}(u) = 1$.
- Case 2: there exists G', a C_4^1 in $G \setminus U$.
- Case 3: there exists G', a C_4^2 in $G \setminus U$.
- Case 4: there exists $u \in B \setminus U$ such that $d_{\bar{U}}(u) = 2$.

Note that, by property (e) and the connectivity of G, we know that, as long as $G \setminus U$ is not the empty graph, at least one of these four cases should apply. We study each case and show that for each of them, we can find a new triple (U', M', γ') starting from (U, M, γ) such that U is a proper subset of U', M is a proper subset of M', γ is the restriction of γ' to U, and properties (a) to (h) hold for (U', M', γ'), where s', d', and f' denote the updated values considered in (g). Once $U = V(G)$, we have $s = |M|$, $d = 0$, and $f = |A| - |M|$, and (3) implies that $|M| \geq \frac{5}{9}|A|$.

In order to prove that such a triple can indeed be found in polynomial time, we distinguish four cases.

In the following, by *resolving* a pattern P we mean that from a triple (U, M, γ) that respects properties (a) to (h) such that $U \cap V(P) = \emptyset$, we exhibit a triple (U', M', γ') that also respects properties (a) to (h) and such that $U' = U \cup V(P)$.

Case 1: there exists $u \in B \setminus U$ such that $d_{\bar{U}}(u) = 1$.

Assume that $d_{\bar{U}}(u) = 1$ and let v be the only neighbor of u in $A \setminus U$. Let $\{u_i : i \in [k]\}$ be the set of all vertices u in $B \setminus U$ with $N_G(u) \setminus U = \{v\}$. Note that $1 \leq k \leq 3$. Let $U' = U \cup \{v\} \cup \{u_i : i \in [k]\}$. By construction of G, we know that every vertex u_i, $i \in [k]$, is of degree at least 2 in G, so it has at least one neighbor in $A \cap U$. For every $i \in [k]$, we define $W_i = N_G(u_i) \cap U$. Note that for $i, j \in [k]$ with $i \neq j$, W_i and W_j can intersect. Let n_d be the number $|\{w \in \bigcup_{i \in [k]} W_i : \gamma(w) = \vdash\}|$. Note that for each u_i, $i \in [k]$, $v \in N_G(u_i)$ and $v \notin U$. This implies that for each $i \in [k]$, $|W_i| \leq 2$, and so, $n_d \leq 6$.

First, assume that $n_d \leq 4$. Let M' arise from M by adding the edge $u_1 v$. Let γ' be obtained from γ where $\gamma'(v) = \top$, and for each $w \in \bigcup_{i \in [k]} W_i$, such that $\gamma(w) = \vdash$, then $\gamma'(w) = \bot$. Clearly, replacing (U, M, γ) with (U', M', γ'), we maintain properties (a) to (f). By construction of γ', we have that $s' = s + 1$, $d' = d - n_d$, and $f' = f + n_d$. As $n_d \leq 4$, property (g) is maintained. Note that $\gamma'^{-1}(\vdash) \subseteq \gamma^{-1}(\vdash)$. This implies that property (h) is maintained.

Assume now that $n_d \geq 5$. This implies that $k = 3$, and two sets of $\{W_i : i \in [k]\}$, say W_1 and W_2, are such that $\{w \in W_1 \cup W_2 : \gamma(w) \neq \vdash\} = \emptyset$ and $|W_1| = |W_2| = 2$. Because of condition (2), we know that we can find $w_1 \in W_1 \setminus W_2$ and $w_2 \in W_2 \setminus W_1$. Let M' arise from M by adding the edges $u_1 w_1$ and $u_2 w_2$. Let γ' be obtained from γ where $\gamma'(v) = \bot$, for each $w \in (\bigcup_{i \in [k]} W_i) \setminus \{w_1, w_2\}$, such that $\gamma(w) = \vdash$, then $\gamma'(w) = \bot$ and $\gamma'(w_1) = \gamma'(w_2) = \top$. Note that M' is a uniquely restricted matching. Clearly, replacing (U, M, γ) with (U', M', γ'), we maintain properties (a) to (f). Then by construction of γ' we obtain that $s' = s+2$, $d' = d - n_d$, and $f' = f + n_d - 2 + 1$. We obtain that $s' - (d' + f') = s - (d + f) + 3$. As, $n_d \leq 6$, property (g) is maintained. Note that $\gamma'^{-1}(\vdash) \subseteq \gamma^{-1}(\vdash)$. This implies that property (h) is maintained.

Case 2: there exists a C_4^1 G' in $G \setminus U$.

We assume in this case that for every $u \in B \setminus U$, $d_{\bar{U}}(u) \geq 2$. Let $V(G') \cap A = \{a_1, a_2\}$ such that $d_G(a_1) = 3$ and $V(G') \cap B = \{b_1, b_2\}$. For this case, when we say that we define M' and γ' by updating the values of M and γ according to a figure, it means that we add to M every red edge of the figure and for every v of A that is depicted in the figure, then $\gamma'(v) = \top$ if v is the endpoint of a red edge, and $\gamma'(v) = \bot$ otherwise.

First, assume that $N_G(b_1) \setminus U = N_G(b_2) \setminus U = \{a_1, a_2\}$. If the only vertex of $N_G(a_1) \setminus V(G')$ is inside another C_4, then we are in the situation depicted in Fig. 3(ii) and we define U' to be the union of U and the vertices of the two C_4's, and we define M' and γ' by updating the values of M and γ according to Fig. 3(ii). Otherwise, we are in the situation depicted in Fig. 3(i), we define U' to be $U \cup V(G')$, and we define M' and γ' by updating the values of M and γ according to Fig. 3(i). In both cases, one can see that properties (a) to (h) are maintained.



(i) Not attached to a C_4. (ii) Attached to a C_4.

Fig. 3. First case of C_4^1.

Secondly, assume that there exists $a_3 \in A \setminus U$ such that $a_3 \in N_G(b_2)$ and $a_3 \notin N_G(b_1)$. If there exists b_3 with neighbors only in $U \cup V(G) \cup \{a_3\}$, then we define U' to be the union of U and $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3\}$, and we define M' and γ' by updating the values of M and γ according to Fig. 4(ii). Otherwise, we are in the situation depicted in Fig. 4(i), we define U' to be $U \cup V(G') \cup \{a_3\}$, and we define M' and γ' by updating the values of M and γ according to Fig. 4(i). In both cases we can see that properties (a) to (h) are maintained.



(i) If b_3 does not exist. (ii) If b_3 exists.

Fig. 4. Second case of C_4^1.



Fig. 5. Third case of C_4^1.

Third, assume that there exists a_3 and a_4 in $A \setminus U$ such that $a_3 \in N_G(b_2)$, $a_3 \notin N_G(b_1)$, $a_4 \in N_G(b_1)$, and $a_4 \notin N_G(b_2)$. This case is the most involved one, as many subcases have to be considered. Namely, we need to take care that there is no vertex in $B \setminus U'$ of degree 0 in $G - U'$ and to make sure that property (h) is maintained. In order to reduce the number of subcases, we sometimes do not take into consideration some vertex u of B that became of degree 0 in $G - U$ after the update of U' in the cases where property (g) is still maintained with the value of s'', f'', and d'' such that $d'' = d' - 2$ and $f'' = f' + 2$. This excludes the case where u is connected to $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ such that $\gamma'(v_i) = \vdash$ for every $i \in [3]$ and then we can safely define $U'' = U' \cup \{u\}$, $M'' = M' \cup \{\{u, v_1\}\}$, and $\gamma''(v) = \gamma'(v)$ for every $v \in (A \cap U') \setminus \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, $\gamma''(v_1) = \top$, and $\gamma''(v_2) = \gamma''(v_3) = \bot$. The same applies to the case where u is connected to $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ such that there exists $i \in [3]$ such that $\gamma'(v_i) \neq \vdash$. In this case, we only add u to U' without adding edges to M', but for every $i \in [3]$ such that $\gamma'(v_i) = \vdash$, then $\gamma'(v_i) = \bot$. This last condition is necessary in order to make sure that property (d) is maintained. In both cases, we will ignore these vertices of B in the analysis, but we need to keep in mind that we need to add them each time one of these cases appears. We also sometime forget the third neighbor of a vertex of A whenever its existence does not change how to resolve the pattern.

Let $K = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, b_1, b_2\}$. As there are at most five edges between K and $V(G) \setminus (U \cup K)$, at most two vertices of B can become of degree 0. We depict in Fig. 5 every possible way these vertices can be connected to K together with the possible extra edge from K to $V(G) \setminus (U \cup K)$. First note that Patterns (ii), (iii), and (x) have no neighbor outside of the pattern and contain less than 10 vertices, so we have already resolved these patterns. Note also that Patterns (iv), (v), (vi), and (ix) correspond to patterns of condition (1) and so are not in G. Moreover, Patterns (xi), (xii), and (xiii) do not need to have vertices labeled $\vdash$ in order to define the triple (U', M', γ') that incorporates the corresponding pattern to the part already treated and that respects properties (a) to (h). Therefore, there are only three remaining patterns to resolve, namely (i), (vii), and (viii). Note that in these three cases, there is at most one extra vertex of B.

In the following, we focus our attention on Pattern (i) but the same arguments apply to Patterns (vii) and (viii). As discussed above, we need to take care of property (h). If the pattern has no neighbor inside a C_4, then we can extend the triple (U, M, γ) where the vertices of A of this pattern that will not be labeled $\top$ are labeled $\vdash$. Note that in this case, properties (a) to (h) are maintained. Assume that there is a C_4 such that exactly one vertex of this C_4 is a neighbor of a vertex of K. Then we are in on of the cases depicted in Fig. 6, and we can extend the triple (U, M, γ). Assume now that it is not the case and there is a C_4 with two vertices of this C_4 that have a neighbor in K. Then we are in one of the cases depicted in Fig. 7. For Pattern (xviii), it cannot exist because of condition (1). For Pattern (xvi), we can extend the triple (U, M, γ) according to the figure. For Pattern (xvii), we assume that for both C_4's of this pattern, we cannot have either Pattern (xvi) or any of the patterns of Fig 6. Otherwise, we start by solving one of these patterns. This implies that we can extend the triple (U, M, γ) where the vertices of A of the pattern that will not be labeled $\top$ are labeled $\vdash$, and still respect property (h).



Fig. 6. Fourth case of C_4^1.



Pattern (xvi).



Pattern (xvii). Pattern (xviii).

Fig. 7. Fifth case of C_4^1.

Case 3: there exists a C_4^2 G' in $G \setminus U$.

We assume in this case that for every $u \in B \setminus U$, $d_{\bar{U}}(u) \geq 1$ and there is no C_4^1 in $G - U$. In particular, this implies that Case 2 will not occur anymore, and therefore, in the following property (h) will always be maintained. Thus, now we only focus on properties (a) to (g). Let $V(G') \cap A = \{a_1, a_2\}$ and $V(G') \cap B = \{b_1, b_2\}$. For this case, when we say that we define M' and γ' by updating the values of M and γ according to a figure, it means that we add to M every red edge of the figure and for every v of A that is depicted in the figure, then $\gamma'(v) = \top$ if v is either the endpoint of a red edge or $v \in U$ and $\gamma(v) = \top$, otherwise either v has a neighbor outside of the pattern depicted in the figure, and thus $\gamma'(v) = \vdash$, or it does not and thus $\gamma'(v) = \bot$.

First, assume that $N_G(b_1) = N_G(b_2) = \{a_1, a_2\}$. In this case, we need to distinguish between the labels of the vertices of $(N_G(b_1) \cup N_G(b_2)) \cap U$. There are four possibilities depicted in Fig. 8. We define U' to be the union of U and



Fig. 8. First cases of C_4^2. The vertices of $A \cap U$ labeled $\perp$ are treated in the same way than vertices labeled $\vdash$. If both are connected to the same vertex labeled $\top$, the case depicted in subfigure (i) applies.

the vertices of G', and we define M' and γ' by updating the values of M and γ according to Fig. 8. One can check that, in each case, properties (a) to (g) are maintained.

Secondly, assume that there exists $a_3 \in A \setminus U$ such that $a_3 \in N_G(b_2)$ and $a_3 \notin N_G(b_1)$. Then we are in the case depicted in Fig. 9. We define U' to be the union of U and the vertices of G', and we define M' and γ' by updating the values of M and γ according to Fig. 9. One can check that properties (a) to (g) are maintained.



Fig. 9. Second case of C_4^2.

Thirdly, assume that there exist a_3 and a_4 in $A \setminus U$ such that $a_3 \in N_G(b_2)$, $a_3 \notin N_G(b_1)$, $a_4 \in N_G(b_1)$, and $a_4 \notin N_G(b_2)$. As in Case 2, this situation is a bit more complicated to handle, but now we do not need to take care of property (h), which simplifies the case analysis compared to Case 2. Again, we shall ignore the vertices of B that became of degree 0 after the removal of the new U' when the situation is favorable to us, i.e., in exactly the same situations as in Case 2, and thus it does not interfere with the fact that the new triple (U', M', γ') respects property (g). We also sometimes forget the third neighbor of a vertex of A when its existence does not change how to resolve the pattern. Using the fact that, by condition (2), two vertices cannot have the same neighborhood, it follows that the possible patterns are those depicted in Fig. 10. As Pattern (ii) is not connected to the rest of the graph and has less than 10 neighbors, it has already been treated by the algorithm. Note that Pattern (iii) cannot exist because of condition (1). For all other patterns, namely Pattern (i) and Patterns (iv) to (ix), we define U' to be the union of U and the vertices of the given pattern, and we define M' and γ' by updating the values of M and γ according to Fig. 9. One can check that properties (a) to (g) are maintained.



Fig. 10. Third case of C_4^2.

Case 4: there exists $u \in B \setminus U$ such that $d_{\bar{U}}(u) = 2$.

We assume in this case that for every $u \in B \setminus U$, $d_{\bar{U}}(u) \geq 2$, and that there is no C_4 in $G - U$.

Let $u \in B \setminus U$ such that $d_{\bar{U}}(u) = 2$. Let $\{v_1, v_2\} = N_G(u) \setminus U$ and $W = N_G(u) \cap U$, and $U' = U \cup \{u, v_1, v_2\}$. Note that both v_1 and v_2 have at least one neighbor that is not in U. Note also that $|W| \leq 1$.

Assume first that $W = \emptyset$ or $W = \{w\}$ and $\gamma(w) \neq \vdash$. Let M' arise from M by adding the edge uv_1. Let γ' be obtained from γ where $\gamma'(v_1) = \top$ and $\gamma'(v_2) = \vdash$. Clearly, replacing (U, M, γ) with (U', M', γ'), properties (a) to (f) are maintained. We obtain that $s' = s + 1$, $d' = d + 1$, and $f' = f$. These inequalities directly imply that property (g) is maintained.

Assume now that $W = \{w\}$ and $\gamma(w) = \vdash$. Let M' arise from M by adding the edge uw. Let γ' be obtained from γ where $\gamma'(v_1) = \gamma'(v_2) = \vdash$ and $\gamma'(w) = \top$. Clearly, replacing (U, M, γ) with (U', M', γ'), properties (a) to (f) are maintained. We obtain anew that $s' = s + 1$, $d' = d + 1$, and $f' = f$. These inequalities imply again that property (g) is maintained.

Since the considered cases exhaust all possibilities, and in each case we described an extension that maintains the relevant properties, the proof is complete up to the running time of the algorithm, which we proceed to analyze. One can easily check whether an extension operation can be realized in time $O(n)$, where $n = n(G)$. Indeed, we consider a constant number of patterns, and in each of them we fix a specific vertex. Then, for each vertex in $V(G) \setminus U$, we can check whether this vertex corresponds to a specific vertex of one of the patterns in constant time, by exploring the neighborhood at distance at most $p-1$ from this vertex, where $p = 11$ is the size of the largest pattern (cf. Fig. 6). As in each extension operation the size of U is incremented by at least one, it follows that the overall running time of the algorithm is $O(n^2)$. □

Equipped with Lemma 2, we are now ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2: Again, we give an algorithmic proof such that the running time of the corresponding algorithm is polynomial in $n(G)$. Let $\alpha = \frac{5}{9}$ and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all bipartite graphs G of maximum degree at most 3 such that every component of G has a vertex of degree at most 2. First, we prove that, for every given graph G in $\mathcal{G}$, one can find in polynomial time a uniquely restricted matching M of size at least $\alpha\nu_{ur}(G)$. Therefore, let G be in $\mathcal{G}$.

In order to be able to apply Lemma 2, we apply some reductions. Namely, as long as at least one of the following conditions is fulfilled in G, we apply the corresponding reduction, which is described and analyzed below:

- *Condition (1)*: G contains one of the patterns $R.1$, $R.2$, $R.3$, $R.4$, $R.5$, or $R.6$ depicted in Fig. 2.
- *Condition (2)*: There exist two vertices in G with the same neighborhood.
- *Condition (3)*: There exists a vertex u in G of degree 1.
- *Condition (4)*: There exists a vertex u in G of degree 0.

Reduction (1). First, if there is in G a subgraph P isomorphic to the pattern $R.1$ or the pattern $R.2$ depicted in Fig. 2(i) and Fig. 2(ii), respectively, such that only the vertex x has a neighbor outside of P in G, then we define G' to be the graph obtained from G by removing every vertex of P except vertex x as depicted in Fig. 2(i) and Fig. 2(ii). Then, if there is in G a subgraph P isomorphic to the pattern $R.3$ or the pattern $R.4$ depicted in Fig. 2(iii) and Fig. 2(iv), respectively, such that only the vertices x and y have a neighbor outside of P in G, then we define G' to be the graph obtained from G by removing every vertex of P except vertices x and y as depicted in Fig. 2(iii) ad Fig. 2(iv). Finally, if there is in G a subgraph P isomorphic to the pattern $R.5$ or the pattern $R.6$ depicted in Fig. 2(v) and Fig. 2(vi), respectively, such that only the vertices x, y, and z have a neighbor outside of P in G, then we define G' to be the graph obtained from G by removing every vertex of P except vertices x, y, and z as depicted in Fig. 2(v) and Fig. 2(vi).

Let M^* be the set of red edges depicted in the corresponding figures. Then $\nu_{ur}(G') \geq \nu_{ur}(G) - |M^*|$. Indeed, in each case, we can exhaustively check that we cannot select more edges inside the pattern P, and in each configuration we provide, in the figures, a solution that leaves vertex x (and vertices y and z, if they exist) free to be taken from outside of P. Moreover, the choice of the red edges is such that they cannot be inside any alternating cycle, whatever the

edges we select outside of P. If M' is a uniquely restricted matching of G', then $M' \cup M^*$ is a uniquely restricted matching of G.

Reduction (2). Assume that v and v' are two vertices having exactly the same neighborhood in G. We define $G' = G - \{v'\}$. Indeed, v and v' cannot be inside the same uniquely restricted matching, as otherwise there would exist an alternating cycle. This implies that $\nu_{ur}(G') \geq \nu_{ur}(G)$. Hence, we can safely remove v' from G. If M' is a uniquely restricted matching of G', then M' is a uniquely restricted matching of G.

Reduction (3). If G has a vertex u of degree 1, and v is the neighbor of u, then let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$. Clearly, $\nu_{ur}(G') \geq \nu_{ur}(G) - 1$, and if M' is a uniquely restricted matching of G', then $M' \cup \{uv\}$ is a uniquely restricted matching of G.

Reduction (4). If G has a vertex u of degree 0, then let $G' = G - \{u\}$. Clearly, $\nu_{ur}(G') = \nu_{ur}(G)$, and if M' is a uniquely restricted matching of G', then M' is a uniquely restricted matching of G.

In each of the four reductions defined above, note that the graph G' belongs to $\mathcal{G}$. Similarly to in the proof of Lemma 2, it can be checked whether a reduction can be realized in time $O(n)$, where $n = n(G)$.

By iteratively repeating these reductions, we eventually obtain a set M_1 of edges of G as well as a subgraph G_2 of G such that $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}$, G_2 does not contain a subgraph P isomorphic to one of the patterns $R.1$, $R.2$, $R.3$, $R.4$, $R.5$, or $R.6$ depicted in Fig. 2, G_2 does not contain two vertices with the same neighborhood, $\nu_{ur}(G_2) \geq \nu_{ur}(G) - |M_1|$, $M_1 \cup M_2$ is a uniquely restricted matching of G for every uniquely restricted matching M_2 of G_2, and either $n(G_2) = 0$ or $\delta(G_2) \geq 2$. Now, by suitably choosing the bipartition of each component K of G_2, and applying Lemma 2 to K, one can determine in polynomial time a uniquely restricted matching M_2 of G_2 with $|M_2| \geq \alpha\nu_{ur}(G_2)$. Since the set $M_1 \cup M_2$ is a uniquely restricted matching of G of size at least $|M_1| + \alpha\nu_{ur}(G_2) \geq |M_1| + \alpha(\nu_{ur}(G) - |M_1|) \geq \alpha\nu_{ur}(G)$, the proof of our claim about $\mathcal{G}$ is complete. Note that the overall running time of the algorithm for graphs in $\mathcal{G}$ is $O(n^2)$, since each reduction strictly decreases the size of the graph, and the algorithm of Lemma 2 also runs in time $O(n^2)$.

Now, let G be a given connected bipartite graph G of maximum degree at most 3. If G is not 3-regular, then $G \in \mathcal{G}$, and the desired statement already follows. Hence, we may assume that G is 3-regular, which implies that its two partite sets A and B are of the same order. By [29], we can efficiently decide whether $\nu_{ur}(G) = \nu(G)$. Furthermore, if $\nu_{ur}(G) = \nu(G)$, then, again by [29], we can efficiently determine a maximum matching that is uniquely restricted. Hence, we may assume that $\nu_{ur}(G) < \nu(G)$. This implies that $\nu_{ur}(G) < |A|$, and, hence, there is some vertex u in $V(G)$ such that $\nu_{ur}(G - u) = \nu_{ur}(G)$. Since $G - u \in \mathcal{G}$ for every vertex u of G, considering the $n(G)$ induced subgraphs $G - u$ for $u \in V(G)$, one can determine in polynomial time a uniquely restricted matching M of G with $|M| \geq \max\{\alpha\nu_{ur}(G - u) : u \in V(G)\} = \alpha\nu_{ur}(G)$. Thus, we obtain an algorithm that finds the desired uniquely restricted matching. Note that since we make $O(n)$ to the algorithm for graphs in $\mathcal{G}$, the overall running time is $O(n^3)$. □

4 Upper bounds on $\chi'_{ur}(G)$

Our first result in this section applies to general graphs, and its proof relies on a natural greedy strategy. Faudree, Schelp, Gyárfás, and Tuza conjectured $\chi'_s(G) \leq \Delta^2$ for a bipartite graph G of maximum degree Δ, and our Theorem 3 can be considered a weak version of this conjecture. Theorem 4 below shows that excluding the unique extremal graph from Theorem 3, the uniquely restricted chromatic index of bipartite graphs drops considerably.

Theorem 3. *If G is a connected graph of maximum degree at most Δ, then $\chi'_{ur}(G) \leq \Delta^2$ with equality if and only if G is $K_{\Delta,\Delta}$.*

Proof: Since no two edges of $K_{\Delta,\Delta}$ form a uniquely restricted matching in this graph, we obtain $\chi'_{ur}(K_{\Delta,\Delta}) = |E(K_{\Delta,\Delta})| = \Delta^2$. Now, let G be a connected graph of maximum degree at most Δ. We first show that $\chi'_{ur}(G) \leq \Delta^2$. In a second step, we show that $\chi'_{ur}(G) < \Delta^2$ provided that G is not $K_{\Delta,\Delta}$.

We consider the vertices of G in some linear order, say $u_1, \ldots, u_n$. For i from 1 up to n, we assume that the edges of G incident with vertices in $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}\}$ have already been colored, and we color all edges between u_i and $\{u_{i+1}, \ldots, u_n\}$ using distinct colors, and avoiding any color that has already been used on a previously colored edge incident with some neighbor of u_i. Since u_i has at most Δ neighbors, each of which is incident with at most Δ edges, this procedure requires at most Δ^2 many distinct colors.

Suppose, for a contradiction, that some color class M is not a uniquely restricted matching in G. Since M is a matching by construction, there is an M-alternating cycle C. Let $C : u_{r_1}u_{s_1}u_{r_2}u_{s_2}\ldots u_{r_k}u_{s_k}u_{r_1}$ be such that r_1 is the minimum index of any vertex on C, and $u_{r_1}u_{s_k} \in M$. These choices trivially imply $r_1 < s_1$ and $r_1 < r_2$. If $r_2 > s_1$, then $u_{r_1}u_{s_k} \in M$ implies that, when coloring the edge $u_{s_1}u_{r_2}$, some edge incident with the neighbor u_{r_1} of u_{s_1} would already have been assigned the color of the edges in M, and the above procedure would have avoided this color on $u_{s_1}u_{r_2}$. Therefore, since $u_{r_1}u_{s_k} \in M$ and $u_{r_2}u_{s_1} \in M$, the coloring rules imply $r_2 < s_1$, that is, $r_1 < r_2 < s_1$. Now, suppose that $r_i < r_{i+1} < s_i$ for some $i \in [k-1]$. Since $u_{r_{i+1}}u_{s_i} \in M$ and $u_{r_{i+2}}u_{s_{i+1}} \in M$, the coloring rules imply in turn

- $r_{i+1} < s_{i+1}$, since otherwise we would have colored $u_{r_{i+1}}u_{s_i}$ differently,
- $r_{i+2} < s_{i+1}$, since otherwise we would have colored $u_{r_{i+2}}u_{s_{i+1}}$ differently, and
- $r_{i+1} < r_{i+2}$, since otherwise we would have colored $u_{r_{i+1}}u_{s_i}$ differently.

It follows that $r_{i+1} < r_{i+2} < s_{i+1}$, where we identify r_{k+1} with r_1. Now, by an inductive argument, we obtain $r_1 < r_2 < \cdots < r_k < r_1$, which is a contradiction.

Altogether, we obtain $\chi'_{ur}(G) \leq \Delta^2$.

Now, let G be distinct from $K_{\Delta,\Delta}$, and we want to prove that $\chi'_{ur}(G) < \Delta^2$. Among all uniquely restricted edge colorings of G using colors in $[\Delta^2]$, we choose a coloring for which the number of edges with color 1 is as small as possible. Clearly, we may assume that some edge uv has color 1, as otherwise we already have that $\chi'_{ur}(G) < \Delta^2$.

If there is a color α in $[\Delta^2] \setminus \{1\}$ such that no edge incident with a neighbor of u has color α, then changing the color of uv to α yields a uniquely restricted edge coloring of G with less edges of color 1, which is a contradiction. In view

of the maximum degree, this implies that every vertex in $N_G[u]$ has degree Δ, the set $N_G(u)$ is independent, and, for every color α in $[\Delta^2]$, there is exactly one edge incident with a neighbor of u that has color α.

Since G is not $K_{\Delta,\Delta}$, some neighbor x of u has a neighbor y that does not lie in $N_G(v)$. Without loss of generality, let ux have color 2, and let xy have color 3. Let M be the set of edges with color 3.

If G does not contain an M-alternating path of odd length at least 3 between x and a vertex in $N_G(v) \setminus \{u\}$ that contains the edge xy, then changing the color of uv to 3 yields a uniquely restricted edge coloring of G with less edges of color 1, which is a contradiction. Hence, G contains such a path, which implies that two edges incident with neighbors of y have color 3.

If there is a color α in $[\Delta^2] \setminus \{1\}$ such that no edge incident with a neighbor of y has color α, then changing the color of xy to α and the color of uv to 3 yields a uniquely restricted edge coloring of G with less edges of color 1, which is a contradiction. Similarly as above, this implies that, for every color α in $[\Delta^2] \setminus \{1, 3\}$, there is exactly one edge incident with a neighbor of y that has color α. Now, changing the color of uv to 2, the color of ux to 3, and the color of xy to 2 yields a uniquely restricted edge coloring of G with less edges of color 1, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

As observed above, the proof of Theorem 3 is algorithmic; the simple greedy strategy considered in its first half efficiently constructs uniquely restricted edge colorings using at most Δ^2 colors. Furthermore, also its second half can be turned into an efficient algorithm that finds uniquely restricted edge colorings using at most $\Delta^2 - 1$ colors for connected graphs of maximum degree Δ that are distinct from $K_{\Delta,\Delta}$; the different cases considered in the proof correspond to simple manipulations of a given uniquely restricted edge coloring that iteratively reduce the number of edges of color 1 down to 0. Golumbic, Hirst, and Lewenstein [14] showed that deciding whether a given matching is uniquely restricted can be done in polynomial time, and their algorithm can be used to decide which of the simple manipulations can be executed.

Our next goal is to improve Theorem 3 for bipartite graphs. The following proof was inspired by Lovász's [24] elegant proof of Brooks' Theorem.

Lemma 3. *If G is a connected bipartite graph of maximum degree at most $\Delta \geq 4$ that is distinct from $K_{\Delta,\Delta}$, and M is a matching in G, then M can be partitioned into at most $\Delta - 1$ uniquely restricted matchings in G.*

Proof: Let A and B be the partite sets of G, and let $R = V(G) \setminus V(M)$. Note that M is perfect if and only if R is empty. Whenever we consider a coloring of the edges in M, and α is one of the colors, let M_α be the set of edges in M colored with α.

First, we assume that R is empty, and that G is not Δ-regular. By symmetry, we may assume that some vertex a in A has degree less than Δ. Let $ab \in M$. Let T be a spanning tree of G that contains the edges in M. Contracting within T the edges from M, rooting the resulting tree in the vertex corresponding to the edge ab, and considering a breadth-first search order, we obtain the existence of a linear order $a_1b_1, \ldots, a_nb_n$ of the edges in M such that $ab = a_nb_n$, and, for every $i \in [n-1]$, there is an edge between $\{a_i, b_i\}$ and $\{a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}, \ldots, a_n, b_n\}$. Since a_n has degree less than Δ, this implies that, for every $i \in [n]$, some vertex

u_i in $\{a_i, b_i\}$ has at most $\Delta - 2$ neighbors in $\{a_1, b_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}\}$. Now, we color the edges in M greedily in the above linear order. Specifically, for every i from 1 up to n, we color the edge a_ib_i with some color α in $[\Delta - 1]$ such that, for every $j \in [i-1]$, for which u_i has a neighbor in $\{a_j, b_j\}$, the edge a_jb_j is not colored with α. By the degree condition on u_i, such a coloring exists. Suppose, for a contradiction, that M_α is not uniquely restricted for some color α in $[\Delta-1]$. Let the edge a_ib_i in M_α be such that it belongs to some M_α-alternating cycle C, and, subject to this condition, the index i is maximum. If the neighbor of u_i on C outside of $\{a_i, b_i\}$ is in $\{a_j, b_j\}$, then the choice of the edge a_ib_i implies $j < i$, and the coloring rule implies that the edge a_jb_j is not colored with α, which is a contradiction. Altogether, the statement follows.

Next, we assume that R is non-empty. Let K be a component of $G - R$. Let M_K be the set of edges in M that lie in K. Since G is connected, the graph K is not Δ-regular. Therefore, proceeding exactly as above, we obtain a coloring of the edges in M_K using the colors in $[\Delta-1]$ such that each color class is a uniquely restricted matching in K. If $K_1, \ldots, K_k$ are the components of $G - R$, and M_i is a uniquely restricted matching in K_i for every $i \in [k]$, then $M_1 \cup \cdots \cup M_k$ is a uniquely restricted matching in G. Therefore, combining the colorings within the different components, we obtain that also in this case the statement follows.

At this point, we may assume that G is Δ-regular, and that M is perfect.

Next, we assume that there are two distinct edges e and e' in M such that $V(\{e, e'\})$ is a vertex cut of G. This implies that we can partition the set $M \setminus \{e, e'\}$ into two non-empty sets M_1 and M_2 such that there is no edge between $V(M_1)$ and $V(M_2)$. For $i \in [2]$, let G_i be the subgraph of G induced by $V(\{e, e'\} \cup M_i)$. Since G is connected, the graph G_i is not Δ-regular. In view of the above, this implies that there is a coloring c_i of the edges of the perfect matching $\{e, e'\} \cup M_i$ of G_i using the colors in $[\Delta - 1]$ such that each color class of c_i is a uniquely restricted matching in G_i. If $c_i(e) \neq c_i(e')$ for both i in [2], then we may assume that c_1 and c_2 assign the same colors to e and e', and it is easy to verify that the common extension c of c_1 and c_2 to M has the property that every color class of c is a uniquely restricted matching in G. Hence, we may assume that necessarily $c_1(e) = c_1(e')$. Note that this implies in particular that at least one of the two possible edges between $V(\{e\})$ and $V(\{e'\})$ is missing.

Let $c_1(e) = \alpha$. Let $e = ab$, $e' = a'b'$, and $U = \{a, b, a', b'\}$. For every vertex $u \in U$, let $C_1(u)$ be the set of colors β for which M_1 contains an edge vw with $c_1(vw) = \beta$ such that u is adjacent to v or w. If there is some $u \in U$ and some color $\beta \in ([\Delta - 1] \setminus \{\alpha\}) \setminus C_1(u)$, then changing the color of the unique edge in $\{e, e'\}$ incident with u from α to β yields a coloring c_1' of the edges in $\{e, e'\} \cup M_1$ using the colors in $[\Delta-1]$ such that each color class of c_1' is a uniquely restricted matching in G_1. Furthermore, $c_1'(e) \neq c_1'(e')$, which is a contradiction. This implies that $[\Delta-1] \setminus \{\alpha\} \subseteq C_1(u)$ for every $u \in U$. In particular, each vertex u in U has at least $\Delta - 2$ neighbors in $V(M_1)$, and, hence, at most one neighbor in $V(M_2)$. Let $C_2(u)$ for $u \in U$ be defined analogously as above. Clearly, the set $C_2(a) \cup C_2(a')$ contains at most two distinct colors. Since $\Delta - 1 \geq 3$, we may assume that c_2 is such that the set $C_2(a) \cup C_2(a')$ does not contain the color α. Now, let c_2' be a coloring of the edges in $\{e, e'\} \cup M_2$ that coincides with c_2 on M_2 and colors e and e' with color α. It is easy to see that each color class of c_2' is a uniquely restricted matching in G_2. Let c be the common extension of c_1 and c_2' to M. Suppose, for a contradiction, that the color class M_β of c is not

uniquely restricted for some color β in $[\Delta - 1]$. Clearly, we have $\beta = \alpha$. Let C be an M_α-alternating cycle in G. It is easy to see that C contains both edges e and e' Furthermore, since at least one of the two possible edges between $\{a, b\}$ and $\{a', b'\}$ is missing, it follows that C contains an edge between $\{a, a'\}$ and $V(M_2)$. Since c coincides with c_2 on M_2, and $C_2(a) \cup C_2(a')$ does not contain α, we obtain a contradiction.

Altogether, we may assume that there are no two distinct edges e and e' in M such that $V(\{e, e'\})$ is a vertex cut of G.

Now, we show the existence of three edges ab, $a'b'$, and $a''b''$ in M such that some of the two possible edges between $\{a', b'\}$ and $\{a'', b''\}$ is missing, and either a is adjacent to b' as well as b'' or b is adjacent to a' as well as a''. Therefore, let a_1b_1 be an edge in M. Let $a_2b_2, \ldots, a_\Delta b_\Delta$ be the edges in M such that $N_G(a_1) = \{b_1, \ldots, b_\Delta\}$. We may assume that $\{a_2, b_2, \ldots, a_\Delta, b_\Delta\}$ induces a complete bipartite graph $K_{\Delta-1,\Delta-1}$; otherwise, we find the three edges with the desired properties. Since G is not $K_{\Delta,\Delta}$, the vertex b_1 is non-adjacent to some vertex a_i in $\{a_2, \ldots, a_\Delta\}$. Now, if $a_j \in \{a_2, \ldots, a_\Delta\} \setminus \{a_i\}$, then one of the two possible edges between $\{a_1, b_1\}$ and $\{a_i, b_i\}$ is missing, and b_j is adjacent to a_1 as well as a_i. Altogether, we obtain three edges ab, $a'b'$, and $a''b''$ in M with the desired properties.

By symmetry, we may assume that a is adjacent to b' and b'', and a' is non-adjacent to b''. In view of the above, the graph $G' = G - V(\{a'b', a''b''\})$ is connected, and $M' = M \setminus \{a'b', a''b''\}$ is a perfect matching of G'. Let T' be a spanning tree of G' that contains the edges in M'. Contracting within T' the edges from M', rooting the resulting tree in the vertex corresponding to the edge ab, and considering a breadth-first search order, we obtain the existence of a linear order $a_3b_3, \ldots, a_nb_n$ of the edges in M' such that $ab = a_nb_n$, and, for every $i \in [n-1] \setminus [2]$, there is an edge between $\{a_i, b_i\}$ and $\{a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}, \ldots, a_n, b_n\}$. Now, we color the edges in M greedily in the linear order $a_1b_1, a_2b_2, a_3b_3, \ldots, a_nb_n$, where $a_1b_1 = a''b''$ and $a_2b_2 = a'b'$. Note that, for every $i \in [n-1] \setminus [2]$, some vertex u_i in $\{a_i, b_i\}$ has at most $\Delta - 2$ neighbors in $\{a_1, b_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}\}$. We color a_1b_1 and a_2b_2 with the same color. For every i from 3 up to $n-1$, we color the edge a_ib_i with a color α in $[\Delta - 1]$ such that, for every $j \in [i-1]$, for which u_i has a neighbor in $\{a_j, b_j\}$, the edge a_jb_j is not colored with α. By the degree condition on u_i, such a coloring exists. Finally, since a_n has neighbors in the two edges a_1b_1 and a_2b_2 that are colored with the same color, there is some color α in $[\Delta - 1]$ for which no edge a_ib_i with $i \in [n-1]$ such that a_n is adjacent to b_i, is colored with α, and we color the edge a_nb_n with that color α. Suppose, for a contradiction, that M_β is not uniquely restricted for some color β in $[\Delta - 1]$. Let the edge a_ib_i in M_β be such that it belongs to some M_β-alternating cycle C, and, subject to this condition, the index i is maximum. Since a' is non-adjacent to b'', we have $i \geq 3$. Let $u_n = a_n$. If the neighbor of u_i on C outside of $\{a_i, b_i\}$ is in $\{a_j, b_j\}$, then the choice of the edge a_ib_i implies $j < i$, and the coloring rule implies that the edge a_jb_j is not colored with β, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3 fails for $\Delta = 3$; the matching $\{a_1b_1, a_2b_2, a_3b_3, a_4b_4, a_5b_5\}$ of the graph G in Fig. 11 cannot be partitioned into two uniquely restricted matchings. Note that the matching $\{a_1b_3, a_2b_1, a_3b_5, a_4b_2, a_5b_4\}$ though is the union of the two uniquely restricted matchings $\{a_1b_3, a_3b_5\}$ and $\{a_2b_1, a_4b_2, a_5b_4\}$.



Fig. 11. A bipartite graph G.

Lemma 3 also fails for non-bipartite graphs; in fact, if G arises from the disjoint union of two copies of K_Δ by adding a perfect matching M, then every partition of M into uniquely restricted matchings requires Δ sets.

With Lemma 3 at hand, the proof of our final result is easy.

Theorem 4. *If G is a connected bipartite graph of maximum degree at most $\Delta \geq 4$ that is distinct from $K_{\Delta,\Delta}$, then $\chi'_{ur}(G) \leq \Delta^2 - \Delta$.*

Proof: Since G is bipartite, its edge set can be partitioned into Δ matchings [25]. By Lemma 3, each of these matchings can be partitioned into $\Delta - 1$ uniquely restricted matchings. This completes the proof. □

Note that the graph G in Fig. 11 also satisfies $\chi'_{ur}(G) \leq \Delta^2 - \Delta = 9 - 3 = 6$. In fact, the uniquely restricted matchings $\{a_1b_1, a_4b_2, a_5b_4\}$, $\{a_1b_2, a_2b_4, a_5b_5\}$, $\{a_2b_1, a_3b_3, a_4b_5\}$, $\{a_1b_3, a_4b_4\}$, $\{a_2b_2, a_3b_5\}$, and $\{a_3b_1, a_5b_3\}$ partition $E(G)$.

5 Concluding remarks

Our results motivate several open problems. As stated above, we believe that the conclusion of Theorem 1 holds without the assumption of C_4-freeness. We also believe that better approximation factors are possible, and that approximation lower bounds in terms of the maximum degree could be proved. One could study the approximability of the uniquely restricted matching number in other classes of graphs. Finally, complexity results concerning the uniquely restricted chromatic index should be provided.

References

1. N. Alon, B. Sudakov, and A. Zaks. Acyclic edge colorings of graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 37:157–167, 2001.
2. L. Andersen. The strong chromatic index of a cubic graph is at most 10. *Discrete Mathematics*, 108:231–252, 1992.
3. A. Brandstädt and R. Mosca. On distance-3 matchings and induced matchings. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 159:509–520, 2011.
4. H. Bruhn and F. Joos. A stronger bound for the strong chromatic index. *arXiv*, 1504.02583, 2015.
5. X. Cai, G. Perarnau, B. Reed, and A. Watts. Acyclic edge colourings of graphs with large girth. *arXiv*, 1411.3047, 2014.
6. K. Cameron. Induced matchings. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 24:97–102, 1989.
7. K. Cameron. Induced matchings in intersection graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 278:1–9, 2004.

8. R. Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 2005.
9. L. Esperet and A. Parreau. Acyclic edge-coloring using entropy compression. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 34:1019–1027, 2013.
10. R. Faudree, A. Gyárfás, R. Schelp, and Z. Tuza. Induced matchings in bipartite graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 78:83–87, 1989.
11. R. Faudree, R. Schelp, A. Gyárfás, and Z. Tuza. The strong chromatic index of graphs. *Ars Combinatoria*, 29B:205–211, 1990.
12. J. Fiamčik. The acyclic chromatic class of a graph. *Mathematica Slovaca*, 28:139–145, 1978.
13. M. C. Francis, D. Jacob, and S. Jana. Uniquely restricted matchings in interval graphs. *arXiv*, 1604.07016, 2016.
14. M. Golumbic, T. Hirst, and M. Lewenstein. Uniquely restricted matchings. *Algorithmica*, 31:139–154, 2001.
15. M. Henning and D. Rautenbach. Induced matchings in subcubic graphs without short cycles. *Discrete Mathematics*, 35-316:165–172, 2014.
16. H. Hocquard, M. Montassier, A. Raspaud, and P. Valicov. On strong edge-colouring of subcubic graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 161:2467–2479, 2013.
17. H. Hocquard, P. Ochem, and P. Valicov. Strong edge-colouring and induced matchings. *Information Processing Letters*, 113:836–843, 2013.
18. P. Horák, H. Qing, and W. Trotter. Induced matchings in cubic graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 17:151–160, 1993.
19. F. Joos, D. Rautenbach, and T. Sasse. Induced matchings in subcubic graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 28:468–473, 2014.
20. R. Kang, M. Mnich, and T. Müller. Induced matchings in subcubic planar graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 26:1383–1411, 2012.
21. V. Levit and E. Mandrescu. Very well-covered graphs of girth at least four and local maximum stable set greedoids. *Discrete Mathematics, Algorithms and Applications*, 3:245–252, 2011.
22. V. E. Levit and E. Mandrescu. Local maximum stable sets in bipartite graphs with uniquely restricted maximum matchings. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 132:163–174, 2003.
23. V. E. Levit and E. Mandrescu. Unicycle graphs and uniquely restricted maximum matchings. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 22:261–265, 2005.
24. L. Lovász. Three short proofs in graph theory. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 19:269–271, 1975.
25. L. Lovász and M. Plummer. *Matching Theory*. North-Holland, 1986.
26. V. Lozin. On maximum induced matchings in bipartite graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 81:7–11, 2002.
27. S. Mishra. On the maximum uniquely restricted matching for bipartite graphs. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 37:345–350, 2011.
28. M. Molloy and B. Reed. A bound on the strong chromatic index of a graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 69:103–109, 1997.
29. L. Penso, D. Rautenbach, and U. Souza. Graphs in which some and every maximum matching is uniquely restricted. *arXiv*, 1504.02250, 2015.
30. L. Stockmeyer and V. Vazirani. NP-completeness of some generalizations of the maximum matching problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 15:14–19, 1982.
31. V. Vizing. On an estimate of the chromatic class of a p-graph. *Diskretnyj Analiz*, 3:25–30, 1964.
32. Q. R. Yu and G. Liu. *Graph factors and matching extensions*. Berlin: Springer; Beijing: Higher Education Press, 2009.